

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-7 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Both rejections were based on the fact that the claims did not include positive recitations of method steps. Applicant has amended to claims to correct this deficiency. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bruss (WO 99/62282) in view of Kuniyoshi (EP 0344989). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 5, and recites a method for providing network operator-specific performance features of different mobile radio network operators to a mobile radio customer. The method comprises providing a Smart Card for the mobile radio customer, configured to allow at least one subscriber relationship of the mobile radio customer with at least one mobile radio network operator to be defined, defining at least two subscriber relationships on the Smart Card of the mobile radio customer, each subscriber relationship having different mobile phone numbers and separate performance features associated with the different mobile phone numbers, assigning each subscriber relationship to a different mobile radio network operator, the separate performance features being available to the mobile radio customer based on the

mobile radio network operator for that subscriber relationship, redirecting calls at each network operator provided for the mobile radio customer, said call redirections being performed in all involved networks, except for the network of the current location of the mobile radio customer, by always pointing to the currently active identification and phone number of the mobile radio customer, newly setting the call redirections accordingly with each change of the mobile radio customer's location into a new one of the involved networks, automatically renewing programming of the call redirection by means of appropriate intelligent technologies, using the number of the mobile radio customer that is specific to a destination network of the call as the phone number that is transmitted in the calling line identification presentation function, regardless of the current location of the mobile radio customer, and signaling the subscriber being called with the mobile phone number of the mobile customer that is specific for each given country or network. This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

In connection with the rejection of claim 5, the Examiner cited col. 2, lines 52-55 and col. 3, lines 10-51 of Kuniyoshi. In this portion of the text, Kuniyoshi discloses ID numbers assigned to the radio telephone, wherein the ID numbers are selected for purposes of registration and billing as appropriate. There is no disclosure that the *subscriber being called* is always *signaled* with the mobile phone number of the mobile customer that is specific for the given country or network, or that the number of the mobile radio customer that is specific to a destination network of the call is used as the phone number that is transmitted in the calling line identification presentation function, regardless of the current location of the mobile radio customer, as recited in claim 1 ("using

the number of the mobile radio customer that is specific to a destination network of the call as the phone number that is transmitted in the calling line identification presentation function, regardless of the current location of the mobile radio customer, and signaling the subscriber being called with the mobile phone number of the mobile customer that is specific for each given country or network"). Bruss does not remedy that deficiency. Therefore, whether taken alone or in combination, the prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record whether taken alone or in combination as proposed in the Office Action. Claims 2-4 and 6-7 further define the invention, and are believed to be patentable in and of themselves and as they depend from and include the limitations of claim 1, for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Appln. No. 10/529,756  
Amdt. dated August 6, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of April 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Ronni S. Jillions/  
Ronni S. Jillions  
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:me  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\R\rieb\SchmittS\Pro\2008-08-06AmdSCHMITT5.doc